



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Aldress: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,698	09/26/2001	Makoto Misaka	1232-4767	6446
7:	590 03/12/2003	•		
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
345 Park Avent New York, NY			NGUYEN, THONG Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	
			DATE MAILED: 03/12/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action		09/966,698	MISAKA, MAKOTO
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Thong Q. Nguyen	2872
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		
There inal r condi	REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP fore, further action by the applicant is required to a ejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (tion for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe ination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of (1) a timely filed amend	this application. A proper reply to a siment which places the application in
	PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY (check either a)	or b)]
a) [` '	
nave be 37 CFF b) abo	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Itensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extent (1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened of the checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	han SIX MONTHS from the m FILED WITHIN TWO MON ate on which the petition undension and the corresponding and the corresponding and statutory period for reply original statuto	nailing date of the final rejection. THS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP or 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under ginally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	oecause:	
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/o	or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(0	they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appe	eal by materially reducing or simplifying th
(0) \(\text{\tinx}\text{\tinx}\text{\tinx}\text{\texi\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tetx{\text{\tetx{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\tet{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\texit{\text{\t	eling a corresponding n	umber of finally rejected claims.
3.□	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):	
4.⊠	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 11 (See NOT filed amendment canceling the non-allowable cla		wable if submitted in a separate, timely
5.🛛	The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set		been considered but does NOT place the
6.□	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed	SOLELY to issues which were newly
7.⊠	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:	
	Claim(s) allowed: 11.		
	Claim(s) objected to: <u>5 and 7</u> .		
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6 and 8-10</u> .		
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8.	The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a) approved or b)	disapproved by the Examiner.
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Pap	er No(s)
10.⊠	Other: See Continuation Sheet		Thong Q. Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2872



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the device as claimed is not considered as patentable with respect to the cited art. Applicant is respectfully invited to review the art of record in which the art of the primary reference discloses a five-lens-group zoom lens system. The art of Yamazaki is used to show that the whole lens group or a part of a lens group can be used as a compensating lens group for the purpose of compensating lamge blurs.

Continuation of 10. Other: NOTE: Each of claims 5 and 7 would be allowable if each claim is written under an independent claim having all features of its base claim(s)..